

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE USSR

CONSULATE GENERAL
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
2790 GREEN ST., SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94123

Special: The 27th Congress of the CPSU Issue

March 3, 1986

"...The Soviet Union lays no claim to more security,
but it will not settle for less."

"Before it is too late, it is imperative to find a
realistic solution guaranteeing that the arms race does
not spread to outer space."

"The significance that we attach to the forthcoming
new meeting with the U.S. President is that it ought to pro-
duce practical results in key areas of limiting and reducing
armament."

"The struggle against the nuclear menace, against the
arms race, for the preservation, strengthening of universal
peace remains the fundamental direction of the Party's
activities on the international scene."

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV ON CPSU INTERNATIONAL STRATEGY

The tasks underlying the country's economic and social development
also determine the CPSU's strategy in the world arena. Its main aim is

(more)

crystal clear--to ensure the possibility of working under conditions of enduring peace and freedom for the Soviet people. In essence, this is the primary requirement of the Party's foreign policy program. To fulfill it in the present situation means, above all, to terminate material preparations for a nuclear war.

After having weighed all the aspects of the situation that has taken shape, the CPSU has put forward a coherent program for the total abolition of weapons of mass destruction before the end of this century, a program that is historic in terms of its dimensions and significance. Its realization would open for humankind a fundamentally new period of development and the opportunity to concentrate entirely on constructive labor.

As you know, we have addressed our proposals not only through the traditional diplomatic channels but also directly to world public opinion, to the peoples of the world. The time has come to have a thorough understanding of the harsh realities of our day: Nuclear weapons harbor a hurricane with the potential of sweeping the human race from the face of the Earth. Our address further underscores the open, honest, Leninist character of the CPSU's foreign policy strategy.

Socialism unconditionally rejects war as a means of settling state-to-state political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes. Our ideal is a world without weapons and violence, a world in which each people freely chooses its path of development, its way of life. This is an expression of the humanism of Communist ideology, of its moral values. That is why for the future as well the struggle against the nuclear menace, against the arms race, for the preservation and strengthening of universal peace remains the fundamental direction of the Party's activities on the international scene.

There is no alternative to this policy. This is all the more true in periods of tension in international affairs. I would say that never in the decades since the war has the situation in the world been so explosive, and consequently complex and uncongenial as in the first half of the 1980s. The right-wing group that came to power in the USA and its main NATO fellow-travelers made a sharp turn from detente to a policy of military force. They have adopted doctrines that reject good-neighborly relations and cooperation as a principle of world development, as a political philosophy of international relations. The Administration in Washington remained deaf to our calls for an end to the arms race and an improvement of the situation.

Perhaps it may not be worth stirring up the past? Especially today when in Soviet-U.S. relations there seem to be signs of a change for the better, and realistic trends are beginning to re-surface in the actions and attitudes of the leadership of some NATO nations. We feel that it is worth while, for the drastic chilling of the international climate in the first half of the 1980s was a further reminder that nothing comes of itself: Peace has to be fought for, and this has to be a persevering and meaningful fight. We have to look for, find, and use even the smallest opportunity in order--while this is still possible--to halt the trend toward an escalation of the threat of war. Appreciating this, the Central Committee of the CPSU at its April Plenary Meeting once again analyzed the character and dimensions of the nuclear threat and defined the practical steps that could lead to an improvement of the situation. We were guided by the following considerations of principle.

(more)

First. The character of present-day weaponry leaves no country with any hope of safeguarding itself solely with military and technical means, for example, by building up a defense, even the most powerful. To ensure security is increasingly seen as a political problem, and it can only be resolved by political means. In order to progress along the road of disarmament, will is needed before all else. Security cannot be built endlessly on fear of retaliation, in other words, on the doctrines of "containment" or "deterrence." Apart from the absurdity and amorality of a situation in which the whole world becomes a nuclear hostage, these doctrines encourage an arms race that may sooner or later go out of control.

Second. In the context of the relations between the USSR and the USA, security can only be mutual, and if we take international relations as a whole it can only be universal. The highest wisdom is not in caring exclusively for oneself, especially to the detriment of the other side. It is vital that everyone should feel equally secure, for the fears and anxieties of the nuclear age generate uncertainty in politics and in concrete actions. It is becoming extremely important to take the critical significance of the time factor into account. The appearance of new systems of weapons of mass destruction steadily shortens time and narrows down the possibilities for adopting political decisions on questions of war and peace in crisis situations.

Third. The USA, with its military-industrial machine, remains the locomotive of militarism, for so far it has shown no intention of slowing down. This has to be taken into consideration, of course. But we are well aware that the interests and aims of the military-industrial complex are not at all the same as the interests and aims of the American people, as the actual national interests of that great country.

Naturally, the world is much larger than the USA and its bases of occupation on foreign soil. And in world politics one cannot confine oneself to relations with any single, even a very important, country. As we know from experience, this only fosters the arrogance of strength. Needless to say, we attach considerable significance to the state and character of the relations between the Soviet Union and the USA. Our countries have quite a few points of coincidence, and there is the objective need to live in peace with each other, to cooperate on a basis of equality and mutual benefit, and there is no other basis.

Fourth. The world is in a process of swift changes, and it is not within anybody's power to maintain a perpetual status quo in it. The world consists of many countries, each having interests that are perfectly legitimate. All without exception face a task of fundamental significance: Without being blind to social, political and ideological differences all have to master the science and art of restraint and circumspection on the international scene, to live in a civilized manner, in other words, under conditions of civil international intercourse and cooperation. But to give this cooperation wide scope there has to be an all-embracing system of international economic security that would protect in equal measure every nation against discrimination, sanctions, and other attributes of imperialist, neocolonialist policy. Alongside disarmament such a system can become generally a dependable pillar of international security.

In short, the modern world has become much too small and fragile for wars and a policy of force. It cannot be saved and preserved if the thinking and actions built up over the centuries on the acceptability and permissibility of wars

(more)

and armed conflicts are not shed once and for all, irrevocably.

This means the realization that it is no longer possible to win an arms race, or nuclear war for that matter. The continuation of this race on Earth, let alone its spread to outer space, will accelerate the already critically high rate of stockpiling and perfection of nuclear weapons. The situation in the world may become such that it will no longer depend upon the intelligence or will of political leaders. It may become captive to technology, to technocratic military logic. Consequently, neither nuclear war itself nor the preparations for it, in other words, the arms race, the aspiration to win military superiority can, speaking in objective terms, bring political gain to anybody.

Further, this means understanding that the present level of the balance of the nuclear capabilities of the opposite sides is much too high. For the time being this ensures equal danger to both of them. But only for the time being. Continuation of the nuclear arms race will inevitably heighten this equal threat and may bring it to a point where even parity will cease to be a factor of military-political deterrence. Consequently, it is vital, in the first place, to dramatically reduce the level of military confrontation. In our age, genuine equal security is guaranteed not by an excessively high but by the lowest possible level of strategic parity, from which nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction must be totally excluded.

Lastly, this means realizing that in the present situation there is no alternative to cooperation and interaction between all countries. Thus, the objective--I emphasize, objective--conditions have taken shape in which confrontation between capitalism and socialism can proceed only and exclusively in forms of peaceful competition and peaceful contest.

For us, peaceful coexistence is a political course which the USSR intends to go on following unswervingly. In ensuring the continuity of its foreign policy strategy, the CPSU will pursue a vigorous international policy stemming from the realities of the world we live in. Of course, the problem of international security cannot be resolved by one or two, even very intensive, peace offensives. Success can only be won by consistent, methodical, and persevering effort.

Continuity in foreign policy has nothing in common with a simple repetition of what has been done, especially in tackling the problems that have piled up. What is wanted is a high degree of accuracy in assessing one's own possibilities, restraint, and an eminently high sense of responsibility when decisions are made. What is wanted is firmness in upholding principles and postures, tactical flexibility, a readiness for mutually acceptable compromises, and an orientation toward dialogue and mutual understanding rather than on confrontation.

As you know, we have made a series of unilateral steps--we placed a moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe, cut back the number of these missiles, and stopped all nuclear tests. In Moscow and abroad there have been talks with leaders and members of the governments of many countries. The Soviet-Indian, Soviet-French and Soviet-U.S. summits were necessary and useful steps.

The Soviet Union has made energetic efforts to give a fresh impetus to the negotiations in Geneva, Stockholm and Vienna, the purpose of which is to scale down the arms race and build up confidence between states. Negotiations are always a delicate and complex matter. Of cardinal importance here is to lead up to a mutually acceptable balance of interests. Turning weapons of mass destruction into an object of political scheming is, to say the least, immoral, while in political terms it is irresponsible.

(more)

Lastly, concerning our statement of January 15 of this year. Taken as a whole, our program is essentially a combination of the philosophy of shaping a safe world in the nuclear-space age with a program of concrete actions. The Soviet Union offers an approach to the problems of disarmament in their totality, for in terms of security they are linked with one another. I am not speaking of rigid linkages or attempts at "backing down" in one direction in order to erect barricades in another. What I am taking about is a plan of concrete actions strictly measured out in terms of time. The USSR intends to work perseveringly for its realization, regarding it as the central direction of our foreign policy for the coming years.

The Soviet military doctrine is also entirely in keeping with the letter and spirit of the initiatives we have put forward. Its orientation is unequivocally defensive. In the military sphere we intend to act in such a way as to give nobody grounds for fears, even imagined, about their security. But to an equal extent we and our allies want to be rid of the feeling that we are threatened. The USSR undertook the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and it will abide strictly by that obligation. But it is no secret that scenarios for a nuclear strike against us exist. We have no right to overlook this. The Soviet Union is a staunch adversary of nuclear war in any variant.

Our country stands for removing weapons of mass destruction from use, for limiting the military potential to reasonable adequacy. But the character and level of this ceiling continues to be limited by the attitudes and actions of the USA and its bloc partners. Under these conditions we repeat again and again: The Soviet Union lays no claim to more security, but it will not settle for less.

I should like to draw attention to the problem of verification, to which we attach special significance. We have declared on several occasions that the USSR is open to verification, that we are interested in it as much as anybody else. All-embracing, strictest verification is perhaps the key element of the disarmament process. The essence of the matter, in our thinking, is that there can be no disarmament without verification and that verification without disarmament makes no sense.

There is yet another matter of principle. We have stated our attitude to Star Wars quite substantively. The USA has already drawn many of its allies into this program. There is the danger that things may become irreversible. Before it is too late, it is imperative to find a realistic solution guaranteeing that the arms race does not spread to outer space. The Star Wars program cannot be permitted to be used as a stimulus for a further arms race or as a road-block to radical disarmament. Tangible progress in what concerns a drastic reduction of nuclear capabilities can be of much help to surmount this obstacle. For that reason the Soviet Union is prepared to make a substantial step in that direction, to resolve the question of intermediate-range missiles in the European zone separately--without a direct link to problems related to strategic armaments and outer space.

The Soviet program has touched the hearts of millions of people, and among political leaders and public personalities interest in it continues to grow. The times today are such that it is hard to brush it off. The attempts to sow doubt in the Soviet Union's constructive commitment to accelerate, to tackle this pressing problem of our day--the destruction of nuclear weapons--become less and less convincing in practical terms. Nuclear disarmament should not be the exclusive domain of political leaders. The whole world is now pondering this, for it is a question of life itself.

(more)

But, also, it is necessary to take into account the reaction of the centers of power that hold in their hands the keys to the success or failure of disarmament. Of course, the U.S. ruling class, to be more exact its most egoistical groups linked to the military-industrial complex, have other aims that are clearly antipodal to ours. For them disarmament spells out a loss of profits and a political risk, for us it is a blessing in all respects--economically, politically and morally.

In accordance with an understanding reached in Geneva there will be another meeting with the U.S. President. The significance that we attach to it is that it ought to produce practical results in key areas of limiting and reducing armaments. There are at least two matters on which an understanding could be reached: the cessation of nuclear tests and the abolition of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range missiles in the European zone. And then, as a matter of fact, if there is readiness to seek agreement, the question of the time of the meeting would be resolved of itself: We will accept any suggestion on this count. But there is no sense in holding empty talks. We shall not remain indifferent if the Soviet-U.S. dialogue that has started and inspired some not unfounded hopes of a possibility for changes for the better is used to continue the arms race and the material preparations for war. The Soviet Union is of a firm mind to justify the hopes of the peoples of our two countries and of the whole world, who are expecting concrete steps, practical actions and tangible agreements from the leaders of the USSR and the USA on how to block the arms race. We are prepared for this.

(Abridged)

###